

Optical Limits on Precursor Emission from Gamma-Ray Bursts with Known Redshift

C. Blake

Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA
cblake@astro.princeton.edu

J. S. Bloom

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
jbloom@cfa.harvard.edu

Harvard Society of Fellows, 78 Mount Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

ABSTRACT

Making use of virtual observatory data, we present the first comprehensive sample of optical observations conducted before the explosion times of all gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) with known redshifts. In total, the fields of 11 such GRBs were observed by the Near-Earth Asteroid Tracking (NEAT) program from years to hours before the bursts. Though the typical limiting magnitudes from these observations are $R \approx 20$ mag, we find no evidence for a significant detection of a precursor. The deepest non-detection of precursor emission is from GRB 030329, reaching down to an absolute B -band magnitude of $M_B \approx -18$ mag from 6–1500 days (restframe) before the burst. This is of comparable brightness to supernovae, which, in some scenarios for GRB progenitors, are predicted to pre-date a GRB on similar timescales. Since sources cannot be localized to better than ~ 500 milliarcsecond (3σ) with current large-area surveys, unrelated supernovae or AGN activity in GRB hosts could be mistaken for genuine precursor emission. This possibility motivates the need for not only deep wide-field imaging, but imaging at high spatial resolution.

Subject headings: cosmology: observations — gamma rays: bursts

1. Introduction

Constraints on the character and occurrence of precursor emission from gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) offer insight into the nature of the explosions. On timescales of hours to

seconds before a burst, precursor emission could occur from the central engines themselves, by, for example, blackbody emission from the early fireball (Li & Paczyński 1998; Lloyd & Petrosian 1999; Lyutikov & Usov 2000; Daigne & Mochkovitch 2002) or a pre-fireball created in the merger of neutron stars (Rosswog & Ramirez-Ruiz 2002). If GRBs were to occur from stellar disruption around a massive black hole (Carter 1992), then thermal precursors ($T \sim 50$ eV) which decay as power-laws (e.g., Li et al. 2002) might be expected if other stars are disrupted by the same black hole.

If GRBs arise from the death of massive stars, the progenitor star (or its companion, if the progenitor is in a binary system) could produce precursor emission in the form of novae or supernovae (SNe). A precursor SN is a generic prediction of the so-called “supranova” scenario (Vietri & Stella 1998, 1999). In the supranova scenario, a massive stellar progenitor explodes to produce an SN, leaving behind a supermassive spinning neutron star. The neutron star eventually collapses to form a black hole and a GRB. Vietri & Stella (1998) posited the supranova picture as a means to pre-evacuate the space around the GRB explosion and avoid baryonic contamination to the relativistic blastwave. Aside from this theoretical consideration, the supranova scenario is attractive for two observational reasons. First, the sequence of events in this scenario is a natural means to explain transient X-ray features attributed to dense sub-relativistic matter streaming away at distance of 10^{14} – 10^{17} cm from the explosion site (e.g., Piro et al. 2000; Amati et al. 2000; Reeves et al. 2002). Second, the gas behind the SN shock can be thermalized by the time the GRB fireball sweeps through, leading to an apparent constant density medium in afterglow modeling (Königl & Granot 2002; Inoue et al. 2003). This would then explain why GRBs from massive stars would typically not show evidence for a wind-blown medium surrounding most bursts (e.g., Chevalier & Li 1999; Panaitescu & Kumar 2001). While the significance of some of the X-ray features has been questioned (e.g., Rutledge & Sako 2003) and winds are generally not ruled out statistically through afterglow modeling (Panaitescu & Kumar 2001), the possibility of a precursor SN on timescales of days (Davies et al. 2002) to years is a prime motivation to search for precursor emission from GRBs.

As summarized in Hudec et al. (1994), archival photographic plate searches (e.g., Schaefer 1983) for optical precursors (in the context of recurrence of counterpart emission) revealed only a few genuine astrophysical sources, with no definitive establishment of a physically-associated precursor to any GRB. Using pre-images of the fields of seven *Burst and Transient Source Experiment* (BATSE) GRBs from the Explosive Transient Camera, Krimm et al. (1996) found no precursors to $V \approx 6$ mag. Greiner et al. (1995) presented eight upper limits to precursor emission, at $V = 11 - 13$ mag, within 12 hrs preceding BATSE bursts. Had a genuine transient been found before a GRB, the large GRB error boxes (typically much larger than tens of sq. arcminutes) would have required an association based upon proba-

bilistic arguments. Since the chance for unrelated transients to occur in GRB error boxes is non-negligible, the large BATSE error boxes all but prevented an unambiguous association with the GRBs themselves.

Since 1997, over forty GRBs have been localized to the sub-arcsecond level by way of transient afterglow emission. This, coupled with the growing number of large-area survey projects ($\gtrsim \pi$ steradian), dramatically increases the likelihood of deep pre-imaging of GRB positions. Pre-imaging from near-Earth asteroid surveys allowed Gal-Yam et al. (2002) to show that the transient optical source SDSS J124602.54+011318.8 was not an orphan afterglow (Vanden Berk et al. 2002), but instead was a rare class of AGN. Recently, Heyl (2003) suggested that with an increased frequency of GRB localizations from *Swift* (Gehrels 2000) and very deep large-field optical imaging surveys such as the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; York et al. 2000) and PanSTARRS (Kaiser & PanSTARRS Team 2002), constraints could routinely be placed on SN (or, more generally, SN-like) precursors to GRBs.

Other than progenitor scenarios where a SN precedes a GRB, we stress that few models exist that make specific predictions (e.g., of light curves, spectra, start times relative the GRB) for precursor emission. To this end, we have undertaken an exploratory study of public pre-imaging to search for any optical precursor transients at GRB positions. Here, we present pre-imaging observations of 11 GRBs. By focusing on those bursts with known redshift we can translate the derived upper limits into absolute magnitudes in co-moving time. In most bursts, the upper limit to optical precursor emission is ~ 3 – 5 magnitudes brighter than the brightest supernovae known, but comparable to afterglow brightnesses. These derived upper limits are consistent with the known (fainter) brightnesses of the respective GRB host galaxies, later found at the transient positions.

2. Observations and Analysis

Most of the pre-imaging data presented herein were obtained by the NEAT program (Pravdo et al. 1999). From December 1995 to February 1999, the NEAT camera was mounted on the 1-m GEODSS telescope in Haleakala, Maui, Hawaii. From February 2000 onward, the camera was then mounted on the Maui Space Surveillance Site (MSSS) 1.2-m telescope. Another NEAT camera began operation on the Oschin 48 inch Schmidt telescope at Palomar Observatory. Briefly, the NEAT imager on Palomar consists of three 4080×4080 $1.0''/\text{pixel}$ CCD arrays covering approximately 1.13×1.13 deg^2 . Typical exposure times are 20–60 seconds and the images are unfiltered, giving a broad spectral response from 4000–9000 Å. A 60 second exposure reaches $V \sim 19 - 21$ mag (3σ), depending on sky brightness. We also examined the Digital Sky Survey II (DSS-II) scans of the photographic Palomar Sky Survey

(Lasker et al. 1998).

For the 30 GRBs with a known redshift, we queried the public NEAT data archive¹, retrieving all data which predated the respective burst trigger date. Imaging data for 11 GRBs were found in the NEAT archive, all with at least one epoch of high enough quality to produce good photometry. The amount of available data for each GRB ranged from 3 to 80 individual $8' \times 8'$ images with exposure times between 20 sec and 150 sec. The data for each GRB were first aligned with sub-pixel accuracy to the same astrometric grid using bilinear interpolation. A triangle matching algorithm was used to determine a transformation between each frame and a common reference image by taking into account translation, rotation, and magnification. A WCS astrometric solution was fit to the aligned images using reference stars from the USNO-A2.0 astrometric catalog starting from the approximate center-of-field and plate scale. The photometric zeropoint for each image was estimated in the *R*- and *B*-band by comparison with the magnitudes given in the USNO-A2.0. While the photometric errors on individual catalog magnitudes is large (≈ 0.25 mag), a number of stars typically larger than 100 was utilized in order to accurately derive the photometric zeropoint for each frame. The individual images were photometered at the known position of the OT using apertures of radius $1.2 \times \text{FWHM}$ of the seeing (Howell 1989) and local sky subtraction based on an annulus of radii 15 and 30 pixels. Photometric limits were estimated for each image by analyzing the histogram of flux in 1500 apertures of radius $1.2 \times \text{FWHM}$ of the seeing placed randomly within the image. Iterative sigma clipping was used to reject flux values contaminated by stars in order to determine the errors due to the sky background. The standard deviation of the Gaussian distribution of the sky background aperture flux values was used with the previously determined photometric zeropoint to estimate the photometric upper limits for each image. The aperture fluxes were measured at the OT position in both the individual epoch images and the stacked images. Tables 2 and 1 summarize the upper limits for all the NEAT imaging. A subset of the NEAT data on four of these bursts have been presented previously (Wood-Vasey et al. 2002; Wood-Vasey 2002, 2003a; Wood-Vasey et al. 2003). Our photometric measurements of the same data agree with those reports to within 0.5 mag.

Figure 1 shows the stacked preimages of the individual fields surrounding all 11 GRBs. Before making a stacked image of a given field, individual exposures are visually inspected for the presence of defects near the known position of the burst and excluded if defects or cosmic-rays are found. We photometered the 11 stacked images at the position of the GRB and find the *R*-band upper limits presented in Table 1 and for individual epochs in Table 2.

¹See <http://skyview.gsfc.nasa.gov/skymorph/>; Pravdo et al. (1998)

We report 3σ upper limits on the photometry of the individual epoch images and 2σ upper limits for the stacked images. At this level we statistically expect to have no false positive detections for the stacked images and at most a few false-positives in the individual epoch photometry. The histogram of the rms-normalized individual epoch flux measurements is shown in Figure 2. The expected distribution from purely Gaussian errors is also plotted. This figure indicates that our estimations of the photometric errors are reasonably accurate, with a tendency to over estimate local sky values, leading to a greater number of negative flux values. A single epoch detection at the 5σ level shown in Figure 2 is attributed to an observation in very poor seeing of GRB 020813. The OT position for this GRB is in a crowded region with several bright stars within a few NEAT pixels making accurate photometry very difficult in poor seeing. We find upper limits consistent with the known fainter brightness of the GRB host galaxies.

3. Results

As seen in Table 1, there are no significant detections of precursor emission at the positions of the 11 GRBs for which a search was conducted. To place this in the context of physically meaningful quantities, we translate the upper limits to an approximate absolute magnitude in the restframe B -band using a cosmological k -correction. This k -correction is derived assuming an intrinsic source spectrum of $f_\nu(\lambda) \propto \lambda^{+1}$, which approximates the typical median B - R colors of the photometric calibration objects in the GRB fields (in §3.1.2, we vary this assumed precursor spectrum). We use the zeropoints, $zp_{B,R}$, and effective wavelengths, $\lambda_{B,R}$, of the photometric bandpasses from Fukugita et al. (1995). We convert the extinction corrected upper limit, m_R , in the R -band to absolute magnitude in the B -band, as

$$M_B(z) \approx m_R - DM(z) - 2.5 \log \left(\frac{zp_R \lambda_B (1+z)}{zp_B \lambda_R} \right) - 2.5 \log(1+z),$$

where $DM(z)$ is the distance modulus to the burst at redshift z , computed assuming $H_0 = 65 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$, and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$. The third term accounts for the assumed spectrum of the precursor and the last term accounts for the intrinsically smaller bandpass in the restframe. We also find $M_B(z)$ by using the equivalent B -band upper limits and average the two results. Since the NEAT spectral response is broad and the intrinsic precursor spectrum is unconstrained, we expect the systematic uncertainty in the subsequent M_B measurements to be at least $\approx 0.3 \text{ mag}$, and probably greater for the higher redshift bursts. If the precursor spectra are significantly more red (blue) than $f_\nu(\lambda) \propto \lambda^{+1}$, then the quoted upper limits will be systematically too deep (shallow), especially for bursts at high redshift.

Figure 3 shows the aggregate absolute magnitude upper limits from the 11 bursts with pre-imaging from NEAT and the DSS-II. The observation time before the burst is given in the co-moving frame of the host galaxies, i.e., the time-dilation has been removed by dividing the observed time by $(1 + z)$. Our limits are supplemented with a few others from the literature (shown as unfilled symbols). The early upper limit on GRB 030329 (5.6 hours before the burst) is from the RAPTOR experiment (Vestrand et al. 2003; Wren & Vestrand 2003). The other limits are 030329 (Wood-Vasey et al. 2003), 030226 (Wood-Vasey 2003b), and 021211 (Wood-Vasey 2002). The deepest limit on GRB 030329 was reported by Wood-Vasey et al. (2003) from NEAT imaging, but we were unfortunately unable to find such images in the archive to confirm the result. In addition, a 3 minute exposure at the position of GRB 030226 was obtained by Castro-Tirado et al. (2003) using the BOOTES experiment (Castro-Tirado et al. 1999) starting 1.5 minutes before the burst trigger. The upper limit of $R \approx 11.5$ mag (not shown in Figure 3) implies any precursor would have been $M_B \gtrsim -34.6$ mag at the redshift of that GRB.

3.1. Limits on Precursor Emission

3.1.1. GRB 030329

At a redshift of $z = 0.1685$ (Greiner et al. 2003), corresponding to a distance modulus of $DM = 39.70$ mag, GRB 030329 is the nearest known “cosmological” GRB. Its proximity allowed several groups to study the photometric and spectral properties of the associated supernova with unprecedented detail (Stanek et al. 2003; Chornock et al. 2003; Hjorth et al. 2003; Henden et al. 2003; Kawabata et al. 2003). Though this firm detection of a nearly contemporaneous SN suggests a single event destroyed the progenitor—rendering unlikely the possibility of a similar precursor event—it is still of interest to know what limits can be placed on the occurrence of a similar precursor.

At this redshift, a bright supernova-like precursor [$M_B(\text{peak}) = -20$ mag] would have peaked at $V \sim 19.7$ mag and could have remained above our nominal single epoch magnitude limit of $V \sim 21$ mag for ~ 2 – 3 weeks. Since there are temporal gaps in the data, particularly between 30–300 days before the GRB, it is certainly possible that a bright precursor could have been missed by the pre-imaging. However, three upper limits less than 30 days before the burst exclude such a bright SN-like precursor preceding the GRB by ~ 45 – 10 days.

3.1.2. SN-like Precursors

To estimate how restrictive the entire data set is to SN-like precursors, we created a Monte Carlo test by assuming that every GRB in the sample had the same precursor at some random explosion date less than 1000 days before the burst. The working hypothesis is that a GRB with a SN-like precursor would be of type Ib/Ic and so we use SN 1998bw as a template. Owing to the extreme deficit of flux blueward of $\sim 3000 \text{ \AA}$ of Ib/Ic SNe, we only use precursor photometry from bursts that originated from $z < 1.2$. Since SNe generally appear red in $B - V$, especially after the peak, we recalculated the apparent absolute magnitude limits in Table 2 using a source spectrum with $f_\nu \propto \lambda^{2.5}$. Synthetic SN light curves were created from the B -band data of SN 1998bw published in Galama et al. (1998) and McKenzie & Schaefer (1999). For a given peak brightness (allowed to vary from -15 to -35 mag) we randomly selected 1000 explosion dates before the GRB and then constructed a set of synthetic light curves, noting the frequency of synthetic precursors brighter than at least one of the detection limits. For simplicity we assumed no correlation in peak brightness with light curve shape.

For two different distributions of starting times, we computed the probability that the precursor would have been found in the NEAT data, taking the ratio of the number of “detected” sources in the Monte Carlo to the total number in the simulation. The result is seen in Figure 4. For uniformly random explosion dates before the GRB, almost all SN-like precursors brighter than (peak) $M_B \approx -25$ mag would have been detected at some point during the 3 years before the GRBs in the sample. For both preburst SN explosion date distributions, the limits on SNe with 1998bw-like peak magnitudes ($M_B = -18.88$ mag; McKenzie & Schaefer 1999) is not very strong. Following Figure 4, there is only about 10–30% chance that such SNe would have been detected. Therefore, though there are specific time windows when SNe could not have occurred before the GRBs in the sample, we cannot rule out the possibility that a SN with brightness comparable to 1998bw (or 2003dh) occurred *for all GRBs* but was missed due to the sparse sampling of the data.

3.1.3. Power-Law Precursors

GRB precursors could, of course, be of a different physical nature than supernovae. We have also tested the detection sensitivity to decaying power-law precursors. We used a model for the flux of the precursor as $f_\nu \propto (t - t_0)^\beta$ (for $t > t_0 + 1$ day), with the magnitude of the source at one day since t_0 of $M_B(1 \text{ day})$. As above, we simulated 1000 precursors with a characteristic start time t_0 less than 1000 days before the GRB set. The spectral index of the precursor was assumed to be 1, for consistency with the conversion of apparent magnitude to absolute B -band magnitude. For a range of decay indices, β , and $M_B(1 \text{ day})$, we found

the probability of detection using the results in Table 2.

Figure 5 shows the results for two different probability distributions of t_0 . The lines of 0.95 and 0.99 show the equivalent windows for detection of most such transients. For example, if all precursors have $\beta = -1$ and $M_B(1 \text{ day}) = -30 \text{ mag}$, then there is greater than a 99% chance that the NEAT set would have detected at least one such precursor if it occurred less than 1000 days before the GRB. Precursors that fade more quickly easily evade detection in the sample. For example, only about 5% of precursors with $M_B(1 \text{ day}) \approx -20 \text{ mag}$ and $\beta < -1.5$ would be detected in the current sample. Thus, there is little constraint on the existence of faint precursors generated from tidal disruption around a massive black hole ($\beta = -5/3$; Li et al. 2002).

It is of interest to compare the brightness sensitivity of power-law precursors to known afterglow brightnesses. Following from the GRB 030329 afterglow measurement of Fitzgerald & Orosz (2003) and the extinction measurement in Bloom et al. (2003b), the restframe extinction corrected B -band magnitude of the afterglow was $M_B(1 \text{ day}) \approx -23.7$, fairly typical of other long-duration GRBs. Though there were deviations from a power-law, the secular decay after 0.5 days was approximately $\beta = -2$ (Price et al. 2003). Following from Figure 5, had a precursor – perhaps of a similar physical origin as GRB afterglows (a “foreglow”) – with the same parameters occurred for all bursts at some time less than 1000 days before the GRB, there is only a 50% chance that such precursors would be seen in the NEAT imaging.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The non-detection of at least some power-law precursors—at magnitudes comparable to afterglow brightnesses—supports the notion that GRBs are due to explosive catastrophic events rather than due to recurrent activity (e.g., from an AGN, Gal-Yam et al. 2002). For consistency with all the limits presented herein, precursor theories must now posit optical precursor emission fainter than $M_B \approx -25 \text{ mag}$ ($t_{\text{obs}} - t_{\text{GRB}} < 1 \text{ day}$). From the analysis in §3, we can also rule out the possibility that SN-like precursors with $M_B(\text{peak}) \lesssim -25$ and explosion dates less than 1000 days after the bursts occurred for all GRBs in the sample. Likewise, we exclude the possibility that all GRBs in the sample had a precursor with $M_B(1 \text{ day}) \lesssim -25$ and a slowly fading ($\beta \lesssim -1$) power-law light curve. It is possible that a subset of GRBs had precursors at least this bright. While providing the strongest comprehensive precursor limits thus far, despite the nearly 200 photometric pre-imaging measurements of 11 GRBs, the NEAT data are not very sensitive to realistic precursor brightnesses. Even if all GRBs had extremely bright [$M_B(\text{peak}) \approx -20$] SN-like precursors, these would have

been missed with an $\sim 80\%$ probability. Similarly, more than half of precursors with similar power-laws and brightnesses as GRB afterglows would have been missed. Figure 6 shows how various precursors could have been detected or could have evaded detection.

Since GRB hosts are known to be forming stars vigorously, novae and SNe should not be uncommon in such hosts. If the star-formation rate in a GRB host is $40 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ then the canonical SN rate is about 1 yr^{-1} from somewhere within the host. At spatial resolutions of $1 - 2$ arcseconds (such as from NEAT), the best astrometric localizations of a precursor should be ~ 200 milliarcseconds ($1\text{-}\sigma$). This corresponds to a $3\text{-}\sigma$ localization uncertainty 4 kpc in projection at a redshift of $z = 0.5$, larger than the exponential scale lengths of all GRB hosts measured to-date (Bloom et al. 2002). Therefore, any precursor emission could be easily confused with an unrelated SN somewhere in the host (this essentially extends the confusion problem encountered by plate archive studies from the arcminute to the sub-arcsecond level). This disturbing possibility motivates the additional need for high spatial resolution in pre-imaging surveys. To this end, future deep wide-field imaging surveys, such as PanSTARRS, should be sufficient: a precursor detected with a signal-to-noise of 30 at the Nyquist-sample resolution of PanSTARRS ($0.6''$) will result in a positional confusion about 100 times smaller than with NEAT. This means that if PanSTARRS detects an apparent precursor to a GRB within the host galaxy (say one year before the burst), a significant association with the GRB itself should be possible for even the most vigorously star forming host galaxies.

The quality and quantity of “pre-observations” of transient locations will dramatically improve with the increasing size of the National Virtual Observatory². Digital imaging surveys, such as RAPTOR (Vestrand et al. 2003) and BOOTES (Castro-Tirado et al. 1999), have already presented limits acquired a few hours before bursts to the $R \sim 12\text{--}15$ mag level (e.g., Castro-Tirado et al. 2003; Wren & Vestrand 2003). Deeper surveys such as SDSS should be searched systematically for pre-imaging observations of GRB locations. Identification of precursors with SDSS will have the added benefit of color information, yielding important clues about the physical nature of precursors, should any be detected.

The higher localization rates of *Swift* will increase the likelihood of deeper pre-imaging with the next generation of large-area surveys (Heyl 2003). With the advent of large synoptic imaging programs (LSS and PanSTARRS), with the primary science goals to detect near-earth asteroids, the deepest and most frequent imaging will be at low ecliptic latitudes. This observing strategy will be well-matched to satellite missions like HETE-II (Ricker et al. 2002) which preferentially localize GRBs anti-solar. Thus, the rates of deep pre-imaging may be

²See <http://www.us-vo.org/>

higher than those predicted by Heyl (2003). If some sub-population of bursts originate from within the Galaxy or in the local group (such as, potentially, short bursts and supernovae-GRBs), then, as has been demonstrated with a handful of SNe (see Van Dyk et al. 2003), space-based pre-imaging might someday retroactively resolve the progenitors directly.

We are exceedingly grateful to the NEAT team (S. Pravdo, D. R. Rabinowitz, E. F. Heilin, K. Lawrence, T. McGlynn, L. Angelini, and N. White) for making images public and so readily accessible. Without their dedication to this wonderful experiment and user-friendly archive, none of this work would be possible. We thank S. Kulkarni for bringing to our attention a concern from P. Kumar about the possibility of misidentifying the origin of an SN bump *after* a GRB, due to confusion with unrelated supernovae in the host galaxies; our discussion of precursor confusion follows from that concern. We would also like to thank S. Kulkarni, B. Paczyński, and D. Fox for helpful comments on the manuscript. J.S.B. is supported by a Junior Fellowship to the Harvard Society of Fellows and by a generous research grant from the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. C.B. would like to thank the Berkeley DEEP team for their hospitality during the completion of this work. We thank our physics teacher at Bethlehem Central High School, Mr. Neff. We would also like to thank an anonymous referee for their excellent suggestions for improvements to our original manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Amati, L. *et al.* 2000, *Science*, 290, 953
- Bloom, J.S. 2003a, *AJ*, 125, 2865B
- Bloom, J.S., *et al.* 2003b, *AJ*, submitted; astro-ph/0308034
- Bloom, J. S., Kulkarni, S. R., and Djorgovski, S. G. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 1111
- Castro-Tirado, A. J. *et al.* 2003, *GCN Circular* 1887
- Carter, B. 1993, *ApJ (Letters)*, 391, 67
- Castro-Tirado, A. J. *et al.* 1999, *A&A*, 138, 583
- Chevalier, R. A. and Li, Z.-Y. 1999, *ApJ (Letters)*, 520, L29
- Chornock, R., Foley, R. J., Filippenko, A. V., Papenkova, M., Weisz, D., and Garnavich, P. 2003. *IAU Circ.* 8114, 2

- Daigne, F. and Mochkovitch, R. 2002, MNRAS, 336, 1271
- Davies, M. B., King, A., Rosswog, S., and Wynn, G. 2002, ApJ (*Letters*), 579, L63
- Fitzgerald, J. Brodney, and Orosz, Jerome A. 2003, GCN Circular 2056
- Fukugita, M., Shimasaku, K., and Ichikawa, T. 1995, PASP, 107, 945
- Galama, T.J. *et al.* 1998. Nature, 395, 670
- Gal-Yam, A., Ofek, E. O., Filippenko, A. V., Chornock, R., and Li, W. 2002, PASP, 114, 587
- Gehrels, N. A. 2000, in Proc. SPIE X-Ray and Gamma-Ray Instrumentation for Astronomy XI, ed. K. A. Flanagan & O. H. Siegmund, Vol. 4140, 42–49
- Greiner, J. *et al.* 2003, GCN Circular 2020
- Greiner, J. *et al.* 1995, in IAU Colloq. 151: Flares and Flashes, 381
- Heyl, J. S. 2003, ApJ, 592, 401
- Henden, A., Canzian, B., Zeh, A., and Klose, S. 2003, GCN Circular 2123
- Hjorth, J. *et al.* 2003, Nature, 423, 847
- Howell, S. B. 1989, PASP, 101, 616
- Hudec, R., Pravec, P., and Borovicka, J. 1994, A&A, 284, 499
- Inoue, S., Guetta, D., and Pacini, F. 2003, ApJ, 583, 379
- Königl, A. and Granot, J. 2002, ApJ, 574, 134
- Kaiser, N. and PanSTARRS Team. 2002, American Astronomical Society Meeting, 201, 1
- Kawabata, K. S. *et al.* 2003, ApJ, 593, 19
- Krimm, H. A., Vanderspek, R. K., and Ricker, G. R. 1996, in Proceedings of the 3rd Huntsville Symposium, ed. C. Kouveliotou, M. F. Briggs, & G. J. Fishman, Vol. 384, 661
- Li, L., Narayan, R. and Menou, K. 2002, ApJ, 576, 753
- Lasker, B. M., Greene, G. R., Lattanzi, M. J., McLean, B. J., and Volpicelli, A. 1998, in Astrophysics and Algorithms

- Li, L.-X. and Paczyński, B. 1998, ApJ (*Letters*), 507, L59
- Lloyd, N. M. and Petrosian, V. 1999, ApJ, 511, 550
- Lyutikov, M. and Usov, V. V. 2000, ApJ (*Letters*), 543, L129
- Matheson, T. *et al.* 2003, GCN Circular 2120
- Matheson, T., Garnavich, P. M., Stanek, K. Z., *et al.* 2003, ApJ, 599, 394
- McKenzie, Eric H. and Schaefer, Bradley E. 1999, PASP, 111, 964
- Panaiteescu, A. and Kumar, P. 2001, ApJ, 554, 667
- Peterson, B. and Price, P. 1985, GCN Circular 1985
- Piro, L. *et al.* 2000, Science, 290, 955
- Pravdo, S. H., Helin, E. H., Rabinowitz, D. L., Lawrence, K. J., and McGlynn, T. A. 1998, Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society, 30, 900
- Pravdo, S. H. *et al.* 1999, AJ, 117, 1616
- Price, P. A., Fox, D. W., Djorgovski, S. G., West, M., Cote, P., and Jordan, A. 2003, GCN Circular 1889
- Price, P. A. *et al.* 2003, Nature, 423, 844
- Reeves, J. N. *et al.* 2002, Nature, 416, 512
- Ricker, G. *et al.* 2002, ApJ (*Letters*), 571, L127
- Rosswog, S. and Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2002, MNRAS, 336, L7
- Rutledge, R. E. and Sako, M. 2003, MNRAS, 339, 600
- Schaefer, B. E., ed. 1983, in Univ. of Calif., Santa Cruz Summer Workshop on High Energy Transients
- Stanek, K. Z. *et al.* 2003, ApJ (*Letters*), 591, L17
- Schlegel, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., and Davis, M. 1998, ApJ, 500, 525
- Van Dyk, S. D., Li, W., and Filippenko, A. V. 2003, PASP, 115, 1
- Vanden Berk, D. E. *et al.* 2002, ApJ, 576, 673

- Vanderspek, R. *et al.* 2003, GCN Circular 1987
- Vestrand, W. T. *et al.* 2003, to appear in the Proceedings of the SPIE, Volume 4845
- Vietri, M. and Stella, L. 1998, ApJ (*Letters*), 507, L45
- . 1999, ApJ (*Letters*), 527, L43
- Vreeswijk, P., Burud, I., Fruchter, A., and Levan, A. 2002, GCN Circular 1756
- Vreeswijk, P., Wijers, R., Rol, E., and Hjorth, J. 2003, GCN Circular 1953
- Wood-Vasey, M. 2002, GCN Circular 1738
- . 2003a, GCN Circular 1957
- Wood-Vasey, M., Aldering, G., and Lee, B. C. 2002, GCN Circular 1572
- Wood-Vasey, M., Nugent, P., and Lee, B. C. 2003, GCN Circular 1998
- Wood-Vasey, W. M. 2003b, GCN Circular 1905
- Wren, J. and Vestrand, W. T. 2003, GCN Circular 2009
- York, D. G. *et al.* 2000, AJ, 120, 1579

Table 1. Data on 11 GRBs with Known Redshift and NEAT Precursor

GRB	R-band limit ^a mag	RA J2000	DEC J2000	z	$E(B - V)$ mag
030329	21.10	10:44:50.0	+21:31:17	0.169	0.025
030323	21.31	11:06:09.4	−21:46:13	3.372	0.049
030226	21.49	11:33:04.9	+25:53:56	1.986	0.019
021211	22.01	08:08:59.9	+06:43:38	0.800	0.027
021004	21.69	00:26:54.7	+18:55:41	2.328	0.058
020813	21.59	19:46:41.9	−19:36:05	1.254	0.110
020405	20.26	13:58:03.1	−31:22:22	0.695	0.110
010222	19.85	14:52:12.6	+43:01:06	1.477	0.023
000911	20.55	02:18:34.4	+07:44:29	1.059	0.118
000418	20.62	12:25:19.3	+20:06:11	1.118	0.033
000301C	19.67	16:20:18.6	+29:26:36	2.037	0.052

Note. — Redshift references for bursts up to and including GRB 021004 are given in Bloom (2003a). The following references apply to the newer measurements: Vreeswijk et al. (2002) (GRB 021211), Price et al. (2003) (GRB 030226), Vreeswijk et al. (2003) (GRB 030323), and Greiner et al. (2003) (GRB 030329).

^aThe 2σ R -band upper limit at the position of the transient, derived from the sum of all NEAT pre-imaging data for the field.

Table 2. Optical Pre-imaging Limits of 11 GRBs^a

$t_{\text{obs}}^{\text{b}}$ UT Date	$t_{\text{GRB}} - t_{\text{obs}}$ day	Exposure time (N x sec)	R -band ^c mag	B -band ^c mag	OT Flux ADU	σ^{d} ADU
GRB 030329	$t_{\text{GRB}} = 2003-03-29\ 11:37:15$		$E(B - V) = 0.025$	$z = 0.169$		
2002-04-26 09:10:48	337.10	3x20	18.95	19.88	123.8	174.6
2002-04-12 09:41:59	351.08	3x20	20.47	20.82	-11.5	41.2
2002-04-04 08:09:35	359.14	3x20	20.13	20.77	28.4	57.0
2002-04-01 07:00:00	362.19	3x60	20.64	20.53	20.5	111.3
2002-02-13 13:18:36	408.93	2x60	17.86	18.80	169.7	122.8
2002-01-14 10:52:48	439.03	3x20	20.28	20.93	-9.2	51.1
2002-01-08 11:23:24	445.01	3x20	20.35	21.02	-42.9	51.7
2000-04-13 14:15:00	1079.89	2x20	18.65	19.64	-171.3	141.1
2000-04-13 06:37:48	1080.21	3x20	18.80	19.87	-47.6	390.9
2000-03-14 14:15:00	1109.89	2x20	19.25	20.33	-225.6	201.7
2000-03-08 11:09:35	1116.02	2x20	20.26	21.06	-49.7	97.0
1999-02-19 12:30:00	1498.96	3x20	19.43	19.87	225.1	102.6
1998-03-27 09:30:00	1828.09	3x20	19.13	20.02	560.8	213.6
1998-03-26 09:23:24	1829.09	3x20	19.07	19.91	-386.3	209.5
1998-02-23 10:23:24	1860.05	3x20	19.11	20.06	139.4	195.9
1998-02-22 10:23:59	1861.05	3x20	19.43	20.11	-199.1	163.5
1998-01-24 12:50:24	1889.95	3x20	19.54	20.10	81.9	139.9
1955-03-25 06:00:00	17536.23	1x300	18.16	18.93	203.1	2037.3

^aThe complete version of this table is in the electronic edition of the Journal. The printed edition contains only a sample.

^bMean time of observation epoch. All observation dates before 1995 are from photographic imaging during the Palomar Sky Survey, scanned into digital form in the Digitized Sky Survey II. Observation dates after 1995 are from the NEAT experiment on the same telescope.

^cThe $3\text{-}\sigma$ upper limit to detection of precursor emission at the position of the GRB. These magnitudes have been calibrated using field stars and the USNO-A2.0 Catalog (see text). These limits do not include a correction for Galactic extinction (given as $E(B - V)$ from Schlegel et al. 1998).

^dThe $1\ \sigma$ error on the measured flux at the OT position.




Fig. 1.— Stacked preimages of the fields surrounding the 11 GRBs with known redshift, presented achronologically from the trigger date. Images are 150×150 arcsec² with North up and East left. The 5×5 arcsec box shows the position of the GRB afterglow location. The typical r.m.s. astrometric error on our derived plate solution is 0.5 arcsec in both axes.




Fig. 1.— (cont.) Stacked preimages of the fields surrounding the 11 GRBs with known redshift, presented achronologically from the trigger date.




Fig. 2.— Demonstrating the non-detection of precursor emission. Histogram of the rms-normalized fluxes at the OT positions for 60 single epoch observations of the 11 GRBs studied here. The dashed-curve distribution is that expected for purely Gaussian errors with perfect sky subtraction. The higher than expected number of negative flux values indicates that the sky values are sometimes overestimated. The single epoch point at 5σ is from GRB 020813 and is an artifact of poor seeing and the crowded field around the OT.




Fig. 3.— Upper limits to optical precursor emission of GRBs with known redshift. The time before the burst is given in the restframe of the host galaxy. Absolute B -band magnitudes are computed from the extinction-corrected observed optical limits as described in the text. For all but GRB 030329 and GRB 030226, long-lived optical precursors must have been fainter than $M_B \approx -24$ to -26 mag. Any SN precursor to GRB 030329 could not have reached brighter than $M_B(\text{peak}) \approx -19$ mag for the 30 days prior to the explosion. Upper limits derived from the Digital Sky Survey (DSS-II) are also shown.




Fig. 4.— Detection probability window for supernovae-like precursors to GRBs. The solid curve shows the probability as function of peak magnitude that an SN-like precursor with an explosion date randomly distributed from 0 to 1000 days before a GRB would have been detected in the NEAT data. The dotted curve shows the same probability except that the explosion date was chosen uniformly in the logarithmic interval from 1000 to 1 day before the GRB. Dashed vertical lines show the peak magnitude of 1998bw (from McKenzie & Schaefer (1999)) and 2003dh, the SN associated with GRB 030329 (following from Bloom et al. (2003b))




Fig. 5.— Detection window for power-law precursors of GRBs. For each decay index β and $M_B(1 \text{ day})$ we simulated random precursor start times t_0 (solid lines: t_0 uniformly selected from 0 to 1000 days before the GRBs; dotted lines: t_0 uniformly selected logarithmically from 1 to 1000 days before the GRB). Shown are the contours for 1%, 5%, 95%, and 99% detection probabilities. Following from these results, if all GRBs had precursors with $\beta \gtrsim -1$ and $M_B(1 \text{ day}) \lesssim -25$ within 1000 days of the burst, then there is only a 1% chance that the NEAT data would have missed such an event. There is a $\sim 50\%$ chance of missing precursors if all precursors behaved like the GRB 030329 afterglow.




Fig. 6.— Example SN-like and power-law precursor light curves near the detection limit of the sample. The upper limits used in the Monte Carlo test are shown for the power-law test (circles) and SN test (triangles; $z_{\text{GRB}} < 1.2$). The small differences are due to the assumed spectrum of the precursor. Precursors shown are (from left to right): power-law ($\beta = -1.3$, $M_B(1 \text{ day}) = -25 \text{ mag}$, $t_0 = -800 \text{ day}$), SN-like ($M_B(\text{peak}) = -23.0$, $t_{\text{SN}} = -400 \text{ day}$), power-law ($\beta = -1.0$, $M_B(1 \text{ day}) = -26.3 \text{ mag}$, $t_0 = -250 \text{ day}$), SN-like ($M_B(\text{peak}) = -20.5$, $t_{\text{SN}} = -100 \text{ day}$), SN-like ($M_B(\text{peak}) = -19.0$, $t_{\text{SN}} = -10 \text{ day}$), and power-law ($\beta = -1.5$, $M_B(1 \text{ day}) = -24 \text{ mag}$, $t_0 = -2 \text{ day}$). Solid curves show those precursors which would have been detected by at least one photometric observation (and therefore cannot have occurred for all GRBs in the sample). Dashed curves are for those precursors that could have occurred for every GRB but would have escaped detection.